

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims remaining of record are respectfully requested. Claims 1-13 are currently pending.

The Title of the Invention is amended so as to provide a title that is more descriptive of the subject matter of the claimed invention. The specification has been amended to correct for minor typographical errors in the places and manner as suggested by the Examiner.

The amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure and, thus, no new matter has been added. If the Examiner should disagree, however, it is respectfully requested that the challenged limitation be pointed out with particularity in the next Action so support may be cited in response.

The rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by the “Z-targeting” feature as disclosed in the “The Legend of Zelda: Ocarina of Time” (LOZ:OOT) video game instruction booklet is respectfully traversed.

In the LOZ:OOT, when z-targeting is used, the color of the target box changes based only on whether or not the targeted object is an “enemy” type object – it is not based on whether or not a selected throwable item is effective against the target object. In other words, in LOZ:OOT the color of the target box is changed only in accordance with the type of target object (e.g., friend or foe) and has nothing to do with the *effectiveness of the particular selected throwable item against the target*, as set forth in each of applicants’ independent claims. In contrast, in Applicants’ disclosed invention, even if the same “enemy” object is targeted at different times/instances, the target point may be indicated/displayed differently depending specifically on the particular throwable item that is currently being used (i.e., the particular item selected to be

thrown/projected). In other words, the aiming point data can be varied or made different to indicate the throwable item as “effective” or “ineffective” against the same “enemy”.

Applicants’ independent claims 1, 7 and 13 effectively claim, among other things, “storing *correspondence information* between one or more projectile items and game objects *defining which projectile item is effective upon which game object*” (emphasis added). These same independent claims also effectively claim “determining *an effectiveness of a selected throwable item* upon the target object *based on the correspondence information*” (emphasis added). The claimed feature of storing “correspondence information” defining which throwable/projectile item is effective against a particular target object is neither taught, disclosed or suggested by the LOZ:OOT video game instruction booklet. Furthermore, the feature of determining the effectiveness of a particular throwable item based on based on the correspondence information defining which throwable item is effective upon which object is also neither taught, disclosed or suggested by the LOZ:OOT video game instruction booklet.

Consequently, the LOZ:OOT video game instruction booklet does not anticipate claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10 or 13 at least because it does not disclose every element as set forth these claims. See *Lewmar Marine, Inc. v. Barient, Inc.*, 3 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1766 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The rejection of dependent claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the “The Legend of Zelda: Ocarina of Time”(LOZ:OOT) video game instruction booklet is respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully contend that the LOZ:OOT video game instruction booklet neither teaches nor suggests the features or steps discussed above with respect to applicants' independent claims, and since each of the rejected claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 11 and 12 are dependent on one of applicants’ independent claims 1, 7 or 13, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 11 and 12 are likewise patentable and

unobvious over the combined teachings of the LOZ:OOT reference for at least the same reasons. Moreover, it is submitted that dependent claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 11 and 12, are patentably distinct over the teachings of the LOZ:OOT instruction manual for at least the following additional reasons:

With respect to dependent claims 2 and 8, applicants respectively contend that it would not have been an obvious modification of the LOZ:OOT reference teachings to provide transparent or invisible target objects or to provide the claimed “correspondence information” indicating the effectiveness of a particular throwable item on a transparent object, as set forth in these claims. Although the use of invisible objects may be known in the art of computer graphics processing to result in a reduction of the processing load on the graphics processor, such is not a rational reason or motivation for allowing throwable items to effect a transparent object or for storing correspondence information defining which throwable item is effective on which transparent object on an item-by-item basis as set forth in applicants’ claims.


With respect to dependent claims 5, 6, 11 and 12, applicants respectively contend that it would not have been an obvious modification of the LOZ:OOT reference teachings to mark a target item or adjust a weapon trajectory as set forth in these claims simply because it might further aid the player in choosing the right object to use or action to take against a targeted object or result in enhancing the player’s enjoyment as purported in the office action. The features set forth these dependent claims significantly alter the game play strategy and interaction of the player with the game and the manner in which the game is displayed, as well as significantly differentiates the claimed game from other prior art games such as LOZ:OOT in an unobvious and non-conventional ways which would not necessarily occur to a person simply from playing or learning how to play the LOZ:OOT game.

In view of the Applicants' forgoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully solicited. If any small matter remains outstanding, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' representatives at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYTE P.C.**

By:



William G. Niessen  
Reg. No. 29,683

WGN:ap  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100